DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 338 HE 016 866

AUTHOR Whittington, Barbara; And Others
TITLE The Role of Campus Ministry at State-Supported Universities: A Judgment Analysis.
PUB DATE [83]
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Church Programs; *Clergy; Higher Education; *Religion; *Role Perception; *Staff Role; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Campus Ministry

ABSTRACT

The judgmental policies of campus ministry held by campus ministers at state-supported universities were studied. The campus ministers were grouped according to the campus minister's ministry group, years of personal campus ministry experience, size of student body, campus minister's position at the school, and the campus minister's age by decade of birth. The research was designed to provide both clergy and laity with a clearer understanding of the role of campus ministry at state-supported universities. The research questionnaire was developed using the critical incident technique. Supervisors of campus ministry were asked to list the three most important ministry goals or role functions of campus ministry at state institutions. The responses were tabulated and a 17-item questionnaire was formed. In order to determine reliability, a pilot test of the questionnaire was conducted. The 276 participating campus ministers represented 10 ministry group affiliations during 1982. They rated 17 goals of campus ministry and rated a program of campus ministry that would have the 17 goals as principle objectives. The judgment analysis technique was used and the campus ministers were found to be clustered in six judgmental areas related to ministry group. Evidence indicates that Southern Baptists, Catholics, and Methodists dominate the campus ministry movement. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED238338

The Role of Campus Ministry at State-Supported Universities: A Judgment Analysis

Barbara Whittington

Rex Leonard

W. Lee Pierce

University of Southern Mississippi

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Leonard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 016 766

Running head: Role of Campus Ministry

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate the judgmental policies of campus ministry held by campus ministers at state-supported universities when the campus ministers were grouped according to the campus minister's ministry group, years of personal campus ministry experience, size of the student body, campus minister's position at the school, and the campus minister's age by decade of birth. The ultimate goal of the research was to provide both clergy and laity with a clearer understanding of the role of campus ministry at state-supported universities. The questionnaire used in the study was developed using the critical incident technique. Supervisors of campus ministry were asked to list the three most important ministry goals or role functions of campus ministry at state-supported universities. The responses were tabulated and a 17-item questionnaire was formed. In order to determine reliability, a pilot test of the questionnaire was conducted. The subjects (N = 276) who participated in the study by responding to the questionnaire were campus ministers in ten ministry group affiliations at state-supported universities during 1982. They rated 17 goals of campus ministry and gave a rating to a program of campus ministry that would have the 17 goals as principal objectives. The Judgment Analysis technique was used and the campus ministers were found to be clustered in six judgmental areas related to ministry group.

The Role of Campus Ministry at State-Supported Universities: A Judgment Analysis

Campus ministry as a profession is more than fifty years old (Duley, 1976; Overholdt, 1970; and Sleeper, 1980). Its roots lie in the YMCA and YWCA student movements of the late eighteen hundreds (Johnson, 1979). At the end of the nineteenth century churches recognized that most of their young people were attending state-supported universities instead of church related colleges (Overholt, 1970). Many denominations began to sponsor campus ministries on state university campuses, whose chief purpose often was to maintain the denominational identity and loyality of their students (Dahl, 1976; Overholt, 1970; and Southern Baptist Convention, 1980). As time passed, campus ministry was expanded to include the total university community (Keefer, 1979; Overholt, 1970; and Wiley, 1979).

Lanagan (1979) suggested that both the university and the church are involved in determining the role campus ministry plays on campus. The university sees campus ministry as an academic or student life force and asks what preparation the campus minister should have to serve and assist the college or university in achieving its goals. The religious organization with which the campus minister is affiliated sees the campus ministry as a component of the university which fosters a Christian atmosphere.

The 1969 Wesley Foundation study found that clarification of ministerial roles and the search for self-image were among the greatest concerns of campus ministers (Underwood, 1969). Campus ministry has been in existence long enough to have a very large professional staff

and a physical presence on hundreds of campuses (Johnson, 1979). Although this specialized ministry has produced several generations of practitioners and many generations of clients, it is still unable to define its role (Hammond, 1979).

The purpose of this research was to develop purpose statements that could be identified by campus ministers as being relevant to campus ministry and to cluster the purpose statements according to the campus minister's ministry affiliation, size of student body, and campus minister's age. The sets of purpose statements can be utilized to provide both clergymen and laity with a clearer understanding of the role of campus ministry at state-supported universities and to provide educational organizations affiliated with campus ministry with direction in planning continuing educational opportunities for campus ministers.

Procedures

The subjects for this study were campus ministers serving at state-supported universities in 1982. Using a table of random numbers a sample of 55 campus ministers was selected from 3,427 campus ministers whose names appeared on mailing lists obtained from the headquarters on National Campus Ministry groups. There were 276 usable responses and Table 1 shows the ten groupings by ministry affiliation.

Insert Table 1 about here

The sample consisted of 226 males and 50 females and were distributed among four age categories (see Table 2). Almost 64% of the campus

ministers were less than 43 years of age. The sample was further categorized by the size of the student body at the institution where the campus ministry was located (see Table 3). Over 65% of the campus ministries were located at campuses having more than 9,000 students.

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

The critical incident technique was used to develop the instrument used in this study. Developed by Flanagan (1954), the critical incident technique is a method for collecting important facts concerning specific behavior. One-hundred seventy-one supervisors of campus ministry were asked to state what they considered to be the three most important goals of a viable campus ministry. Flanagan stated that the aim of the critical incident technique is to obtain statements from authorities in a field which express objectives to which most people in that field would agree. The responses of the supervisors were tabulated and the most frequent responses were used as items (goals) on the instrument (see Table 4).

Insert Table 4 about here

The instruments were then mailed to the 500 randomly selected campus ministers of which there were 276 usable responses. Each item on the instrument was scored from one to five. An item received a score of 5 if the dimension was scored as being very important to campus ministry; 4 if the dimension was scored as being of more than average importance; 3 if the dimension was scored as being of average

importance; 2 if the dimension was scored as being of less than average importance; and 1 if the dimension was scored as being of little or no importance.

Judgment Analysis (JAN) was utilized to identify the policies by which campus ministers make judgments. The JAN technique, a statistical method proposed by Bottenberg and Christal (1961) and labeled by Christal (1963), uses a multiple regression model with a hierarchial grouping technique to capture and group the rating policies that exist within a group of judges. The policies are identified through the formulation of an association between the items on the instrument and an overall item. The strength of this association is reflected in the value of the multiple correlation coefficient (R). In this case the overall item represented an evaluation of all the goals which were presented to the campus ministers (Table 4).

A basic assumption of the JAN technique is that each judge has an individual judgmental policy. JAN assists in the analysis of individual policies, and identifies the diagnostic variables employed in decision making and the weights assigned to them in the diagnostic procedure. The technique also identifies groups of individuals with similar policies and provides for analysis of policy subgroups (Leonard, Gruetzmacher, Wegner, and Whittington, 1980). The JAN procedure gives an $\underline{R}^2$ (multiple $\underline{R}$ coefficient squared) for each individual judge and an overall $\underline{R}^2$ for the initial stage of the procedure. The initial stage consists of all the judges when each one is treated as an individual system. Two judgmental policies are selected and combined on the basis of the homogeneity of their prediction equations. This results in the least loss in

predictive efficiency of the procedure. The loss in predictive efficiency is measured by the drop in $\underline{R}^2$ between the two stages. The grouping continues until all of the judges have been clustered into a single group.

A determination of the number of judgmental policies that are present among the judges can be made on the basis of the drop in $\underline{R}^2$ at the different stages of the JAN procedure. Ward (1962) and Ward and Hook (1963) suggested that a drop greater than .05 between successive stages represented too great a loss in predictability.

Results

Mean responses of the 276 campus ministers are shown in Table 5. Goals which were rated as most important were number 7 (invest in hurting world) and number 13 (environment for growth). Each of these received an overall mean rating of 4.5. The campus ministers rated goal number 8 (organize for study and action) as having the lowest priority with an overall mean of 3.1. The Campus Crusade for Christ campus ministers gave as high as or the highest ratings of all groups for ten of the 17 goals. The Jewish campus ministers gave as low as or the lowest ratings of all groups for eleven of the 17 goals.

Insert Table 5 about here

Twelve of the eighteen goals were given as high or the highest ratings of importance by the youngest group of campus ministers. The oldest ministers held the highest rating for only one goal, number 15 (pastoral counseling). Indeed, the oldest campus ministers had as low or the lowest ratings for thirteen of the eighteen goals.

In regard to student body size it appears that campus ministers in the medium sized schools ascribed the highest importance on the goals. Fourteen of eighteen goals were rated as high or higher by these ministers than by either the ministers from schools with small or large student bodies. Campus ministers on large campuses, however, tended to rate the goals higher than those from small campuses though not as high as those from medium sized campuses. The small school ministers rated only one goal higher than the other two groups. That goal was number 3; i.e., to provide worship opportunities on campus.

In an effort to determine the goal orientations of the three classifications; i.e., ministry group, student body size, and age, the data were submitted to Judgment Analysis technique (JAN). Characteristics of the campus ministers who evaluated ministry goals are illuminated by JAN which incorporates the strength of association between the ratings of the 17 individual ministry goals and the overall goal rating.

Table 6 demonstrates the judgment analysis system of regrouping classifications of ministers. This process determines the groupings who have made similar patterns in evaluating the goals. Thus in the first part of Table 6 the goals are analyzed by ministry groups. Starting with ten groupings of ministers the JAN procedure shows that group 6 (Lutheran) and group 7 (Presbyterian) were the most alike in the way that the ratings of the seventeen individual goals related to the overall goal. This combination of campus ministers produced a negligibly small reduction in $\underline{R}^2$ from stage 1 to stage 2. The $\underline{R}^2$ indicates the association between the seventeen goals and the overall goal for each iteration. That is,

the indicated $\underline{R}^2$ of .80 indicates that 80% of the variability in the evaluation of the overall goals was accounted for by the seventeen individual goals. The iteration process continues to combine ministry groups until a .05 decline in the $\underline{R}^2$ is noted. At this time the most advantageous combination of ministry groups is revealed. In this case the judgment analysis reveals six different groupings of campus ministries out of the original ten. Groups 1, 3, 4, and 9 are singletons having distinct characteristics by themselves, whereas 2, 5, and 8 were merged and 6, 7, and 10 were merged owing to the homogeneity of their rating policies.

Insert Table 6 about here

Using age as a means of classifying campus ministers four distinct evaluation schemes appeared as a result of the judgment analysis. Each age group surveyed demonstrated a different way of perceiving the subsidy of the individual goals to the overall goal of campus ministry.

Then the campus ministers were classified according to the student body size of the institution of affiliation. The third part of Table 6 shows the campus ministers to have two composite policies. Those campus ministers from small and intermediate size student bodies tended to have the same viewpoint concerning the contribution of individual goals to the overall. Those from the largest schools were significantly different in their perceptions of the individual goal's contribution to the overall.

Discussion

When the data were classified according to ministry group; the Southern Baptist, Catholic, and Methodist groups seemed to have agreement

as to how the individual goals contributed to the overall goal of campus ministry. Their agreement seems to have been centered on moderation. This group perceived all of the items as moderately associated with the overall goal of campus ministry. The goal showing the greatest contribution was number 6 (religious vocation) followed by 17 (sharing of faith).

Another composite of ministry groups combined Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Episcopal. They also showed moderation on goal statements. The Presbyterians perceived goals 11 (personal ministry), 14 (visible community of faith), and 16 (relate faith) as being the most worthy dimensions of a campus ministry endeavor. While the Lutherans were very high on goals 7, (invest in a hurting world), 9 (religious identity), and 14 (visible community of faith), the Episcopals were very high on 16 (relate faith).

The other four campus ministry groups, the Jews, Navigators, Campus Crusade for Christ, and the Interdenominationals all had very different perceptions of what a campus ministry should be. The Jews showed very negative perceptions of goals 2 (fellowship), 4 (student leadership), and 6 (religious vocation) followed by negative perceptions of 10-13 (study of religious topics, personal ministry, faith development, environment for growth). All other goals seemed to make no contribution to the overall according to the perception of the Jewish ministry group. According to the Navigators goal 6 (religious vocation) has the highest priority followed by 5 (involved in local church), 4 (student leadership), and 14 (visible community of faith) for inclusion in a campus ministry program, whereas, goal 15 (pastoral counseling) was definitely not desired as a facet of a ministry program. The Campus Crusade for Christ group had high

perceptions for goals 5 (involved in local church), 10 (study of religious topics), and 15 (pastoral counseling) as being foundations of a campus ministry program, whereas, the interdenominational group showed high interest in goals 15 (pastoral counseling), 16 (relate faith), and 17 (sharing of faith). The interdenominational group showed little interest in the other goals in defining their campus ministry except for number 2 (fellowship) which they perceived as not being a part of a program.

When the campus ministers were grouped by age the older personnel showed the strongest feelings about the components of a ministry program. They perceived the "lynch pins" to be composed primarily of goals 7 (invest in a hurting world), 11 (personal ministry), 13 (environment for growth), 15 (pastoral counseling), 16 (relate faith), and 17 (sharing of faith). The two middle aged groups (33 to 42 and 43 to 52) showed rather modest priority on most of the goals. The youngest of the campus ministers, however, perceived goal number 5 (involved in local church) as highest priority in a program followed by 1 (Biblically based life goals) and 14 (visible community of faith).

In the grouping according to campus population ministers employed at small and intermediate sized campuses tended to have similar perceptions concerning the constituents of a campus ministry program. They also seemed to have the strongest perceptions overall, particularly wherein they rated goals 2 (fellowship), 3 (worship), and 7 (invest in a hurting world) as not being a part of the campus ministry goal. However, these ministers rated goals 1 (Biblically based life goals), 16 (relate faith), and 17 (sharing of faith) as being most contributory. Campus ministers

from larger campuses tended to be very moderate across the board, that is, they viewed all goals as being moderately contributory to an overall campus ministry goal.

Conclusions

The study seems to have revealed a consensus of priorities concerning the components of a campus ministry mission. These components are revealed according to ministry group, age of the campus ministers, and size of the student body at the institution where the campus ministers are employed. Evidence indicates that Southern Baptists, Catholics, and Methodists dominate the campus ministry movement. They revealed a moderation concerning the components of the campus ministry mission and seemed to view the campus ministry as an extension of the affiliated institution of higher learning. Evidence further suggests that Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Episcopal campus ministers viewed the goals from the standpoint of a more orthodox form of protestantism. The literature seems to indicate that these divisions tend to have more rituals and liturgy in their activities. The Lutherans seemed to view the campus ministry as a church functioning as a community within the campus, whereas the Presbyterians tended to emphasize the importance of personal faith in campus ministry. The Episcopals on the other hand seemed to underscore the idea that the campus ministry mission should support an applied religious philosophy. That is, religion should address questions dealing with the way one should live in contemporary times and how one should decide about situational ethics.

The Jews seemed to perceive very little social context within their

campus ministry commission. They viewed the charge very differently from all other groups. Information suggests a sort of introspection about their approach. They were interested in pastoral counseling, individual religious identity and local church involvement in their campus ministry mission.

Church involvement in the student's life appeared to be a cornerstone of the Campus Crusade's ministry. The Navigators seemed to emphasize a religious leadership orientation with a social context. Results also suggest the Navigators as being organizers of leadership development. The Interdenominational group stressed individual student growth and sharing faith with other individuals.

When the sample was reclassified according to campus population, those campus ministers from small and intermediate size campuses seemed more interested in individual aspects of religious manifestations. Moreover, they were somewhat negative on fellowship and group worship. Ministers from the largest campuses seemed more attentive to social programming but were moderately involved in all 17 of the goals.

JAN seemed to be effective in capturing the judgmental policies of the campus ministers when they were grouped according to ministry group. This is evidenced by the fact that seven of the ten ministry group judges had individual $\underline{R}^2$'s of at least .70. Although the lack of a clear understanding of the role of campus ministry may be a problem in the field, it can be assumed that the campus ministers participating in the present study had definite judgmental policies of campus ministry and were consistent in expressing them.

A primary objective of this study was to identify sets of campus ministry purpose statements that campus ministers judge to be important to campus ministry. An examination of the connection between the individual campus ministry groupings and their overall ratings of the goals revealed the sets of purpose statements the groups considered to be important. Because the review of literature revealed that campus ministry appeared to be unable to define its role, it appeared that an investigation related to the role of campus ministry was necessary.

William et al (1969) suggested that allowing judges to become aware of their judgmental policies is as important as identifying the policies. Beatty (1978) suggested that individuals involved in the decision making can discuss, evaluate, and revise their judgmental policies. Since the present study demonstrated that judgmental policies on campus ministers can be identified, campus ministers can look at the sets of purpose statements identified by their ministry group and determine if they form a valid set of goals for campus ministry.

References

Beatty, J. R. Judgment analysis as an experimental facilitator in adult education settings. San Francisco, California: Annual Meeting of Western Psychological Association, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 165 027)

Bottenberg, R. A., & Christal, R. E. An iterative technique for clustering criteria which retains optimun predictive efficiency (WADD-TN-61-30). Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: 65670th Personnel Laboratory, Write Air Development Division, March 1961. (NTIS No. AD-261 615).

Christal, R. E. A technique for analyzing group judgment (PRL-TDR-63-3). Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: 6750th Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, February 1963. (NTIS No. AD-413 128)

Dahl, Gordon. Ministry in a learning society: Toward a new symbiosis of faith, learning, and power. Counseling and Values, February 1976, pp. 52-54.

Duley, J. The significance of campus ministry as seen through its models. In Findings: A report on the United Methodist Campus Ministry Convocation. United Methodist Church, National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education, Nashville, Tennessee: Author, 1976.

Flanagan, J. C. The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51(4), 327-358.

Hammond, P. C. A response. In J. H. Westhoff (Ed.), The church's ministry in higher education. Lafayette, Indiana: National

Institute for Campus Ministries, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 158 690)

Johnson, R. L. Ministry in secular colleges and universities. In J. H. Westhoff (Ed.), The church's ministry in higher education. Lafayette, Indiana: National Institute for Campus Ministries, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 158 690)

Keefer, Y. A response. The Campus Minister, 1979, 2(2), 10-11.

Lanagan, M. A. The distribution of Catholic campus ministers' time among work components established by the United States Catholic Conference and the National Catholic Educational Association (Doctoral dissertation, The American University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 40, 5749A. (University Microfilms No. 80-10696)

Leonard, R., Gruetzemacher, R., Wegner, W., & Whittington. B. Judgment analysis for evaluating a college. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1980, 49(1), 38-44.

Overholt, W. A. Religion in American colleges and universities. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1970.

Sleeper, C. F. The community college: Challenge to the churches. In W. E. Hallman (Ed.), The challenge of the community college to the church. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: United Ministries in Higher Education, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 469)

Southern Baptist Convention, National Student Ministries. Baptist Student Union Guidebook (Rev. ed.). Nashville, Tennessee: Author, 1980.

Underwood, D. The church, the university, and social policy (2 vols.). Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

Ward, J. H., Jr. Multiple linear regression models. In H. Borko (Ed.), Computer applications in the behavior sciences. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Ward, J. H., & Hook, M. E. Application of an hierarchial grouping procedure to a problem of grouping profiles. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1963, 23(1), 69-81.

Wiley, G. Toward parish and community, unreflectively: Visions of campus ministers in the mid-seventies. The NICM Journal, 1979, 4(2), 12-23.

Williams, J. D., Gab, D., & Lindem, A. Judgment analysis for assessing doctoral admission policies. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1969, 38(2), 92-96.

Table 1

Campus Ministers by Ministry Grou,

	Ministry Group	Number	Percent
1.	Jewish Student Union	19	6.9
2.	Southern Baptist Campus Ministry	54	19.6
3.	Campus Crusade for Christ	34	12.3
4.	The Navigators	13	4.7
5.	Catholic Campus Ministry	36	13.0
6.	Lutheran Campus Ministry	21	7.6
7.	Presbyterian Campus Ministry	13	4.7
8.	United Methodist Campus Ministry	29	10.5
9.	Interdenominational	34	12.3
10.	Episcopal Campus Ministry	23	8.3
	Total	276	100.0

Table 2

Campus Ministers by Age

Age	Number	Percent
Less than 33	87	31.5
33 to 42	89	32.3
43 to 52	66	23.9
Greater than 52	34	12.3
Total	276	100.0

Table 3

Campus Ministers by Student Body Size

Student Body Size	Number	Percent
Less than 2,500 students	35	12.7
2,500 to 8,999 students	61	22.1
9,000 or more students	180	65.2
Total	276	100.0

Table 4

Goals of Campus Ministry

Number	Statement of Goal	Short Title
1.	To assist students in developing Biblically based life goals and in the integration of these into the vocation of their choice.	Biblically based life goals.
2.	To provide opportunities for fellowship.	Fellowship.
3.	To provide worship opportunities on campus.	Worship.
4.	To develop student leadership.	Student leadership.
5.	To lead students and faculty to become involved in the local church.	Involved in the local church.
6.	To nurture students who are considering the religious profession as a vocation.	Religious vocation.
7.	To expand the vision of students to invest their lives in meeting the needs of a hurting world.	Invest in hurting world.
8.	To organize groups for study and action upon special concerns and problems raised in the university.	Organize for study and action.
9.	To assist persons in their search for religious identity.	Religious identity.
10.	To provide opportunities for study in doctrine, religious beliefs, and church (denominational) policy.	Study of religious topics.

Table 4 (Continued)

Number	Statement of Goal	Short Title
11.	To provide students with opportunities for personal ministry.	Personal ministry.
12.	To nurture students and faculty in faith development.	Faith development.
13.	To create an environment (organizational structure) in which students can grow in their faith.	Environment for growth.
14.	To develop a visible community of faith on campus.	Visible community of faith.
15.	To provide pastoral counseling.	Pastoral counseling.
16.	To help students and faculty relate their faith to their work in academia and in the larger world beyond the campus.	Relate faith.
17.	To enable the faith community on campus to be able to share their faith with others on campus while respecting the beliefs, values, and lifestyles of these other people.	Sharing of faith.
18.	Assuming that all the foregoing are principal objectives for a campus ministry program, how valid would you judge the overall goal of that ministry to be?	Overall rating of goals.

TABLE 5

MEAN RESPONSE SCORES FOR GOAL STATEMENTS*

Category	Goal Statements																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Ministry Group:																		
1. Jewish	2.7	4.3	4.0	4.3	2.5	2.6	4.0	3.5	4.6	4.0	2.8	3.7	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.0	3.2	4.2
2. Southern Baptist	4.8	4.3	3.7	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.4	3.0	4.0	3.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.4	4.5	4.6
3. Campus Crusade for Christ	4.8	4.1	2.5	4.8	4.2	4.2	4.8	1.8	3.5	2.4	5.0	4.7	4.8	4.4	2.4	4.6	4.9	4.5
4. Navigators	4.7	3.8	1.6	4.2	3.8	3.2	4.8	1.8	4.1	2.7	4.9	4.5	4.8	3.6	2.7	4.4	4.8	4.2
5. Catholic	4.4	3.8	4.4	3.9	3.3	3.4	4.5	3.4	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.5
6. Lutheran	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.8	3.3	3.7	4.3	3.3	4.2	3.6	3.8	4.3	4.2	3.7	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.4
7. Presbyterian	4.0	3.7	4.2	3.8	3.1	3.7	4.4	3.9	4.3	3.5	3.6	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.3
8. United Methodist	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.7	4.2	3.2	4.2	2.9	3.7	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.7	4.3	4.0	4.4
9. Interdenominational	4.0	3.6	3.4	3.9	3.6	3.6	4.6	3.9	4.2	3.2	3.9	4.5	4.2	[illegible]	4.1	4.4	3.8	4.4
10. Episcopal	3.6	4.0	4.4	3.6	3.3	3.0	4.6	3.7	4.4	3.8	3.9	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.4
Minister's Age:																		
< 33 years	4.5	4.2	3.2	3.5	3.9	3.9	4.7	2.5	4.0	3.0	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	3.3	4.4	4.6	4.5
33-42 years	4.1	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.4	4.4	3.3	4.2	3.5	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.3
43-52 years	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.4	3.7	4.4	3.7	4.3	3.6	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.0	4.5
> 52 years	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.2	4.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.2	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.3
Student Body Size:																		
< 2,500 students	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.1	3.6	3.3	4.4	3.1	3.9	3.4	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.4
2,500-8,999 students	4.2	4.1	3.6	4.1	3.7	3.8	4.5	3.2	4.3	3.3	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.5	4.1	4.5
≥ 9,000 students	4.3	3.9	3.6	4.1	3.5	3.6	4.5	3.2	4.1	3.4	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.4
OVERALL	4.2	3.[illegible]	3.6	4.1	3.6	3.6	4.5	3.1	4.1	3.4	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.1	3.8	4.4	4.2	4.4

*Rounded to nearest tenth

TABLE 6

JAN ITERATIONS BY CLASSIFICATION

	Stage	Judge	R^2
MINISTRY GROUP	I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	.80
	II	1 2 3 4 5 (6, 7) 8 9 10	.80
	III	1 2 3 4 (5, 8) (6, 7) 9 10	.78
	IV	1 2 3 4 (5, 8) (6, 7, 10) 9	.76
	V	1 (2, 5, 8) 3 4 (6, 7, 10) 9	.74
	VI	1 (2, 5, 8) (3, 9) 4 (6, 7, 10)	.67
	VII	(1, 3, 9) (2, 5, 8) 4 (6, 7, 10)	.59
	VIII	(1, 3, 9) (2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10) 4	.49
	IX	(1, 3, 4, 9) (2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10)	.35
	X	(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	.19
MINISTER AGE	I	1 2 3 4	.47
	II	(1, 3) 2 4	.41
	III	(1, 3) (2, 4)	.32
	IV	(1, 2, 3, 4)	.20
STUDENT BODY SIZE	I	1 2 3	.31
	II	(1, 2) 3	.29
	III	(1, 2, 3)	.23